PP4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/139,798	08/25/1998	WILLIAM L THOMAS	UV-57	5738

7590   10/03/2002

G VICTOR TREYZ
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY   100201104

EXAMINER
HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	8

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

PP4

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/139,798	THOMAS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Son P Huynh	2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _03_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 August 1998_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-118_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-118_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 November 1998_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) **(2)**
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the word

"that", page 20, line 19, is repeated; application Serial No, page 27, line 27, must be

provided   ·

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application

being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily

published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.   Claims 69-70, 77-83, 86, 89-90, 92-93, 100-106, 109, 112-113, 115-118 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hendricks et al. (US

6,181,335).

        Regarding claim 69, Hendricks et al. (hereafter referred to as Hendricks)

discloses a system comprising operations center 202, cable head end 208 and set top

terminal 220 (see figure 1). Hendricks further discloses the set top terminal 220 stores

data, tracking program that have been selected for viewing. By gathering this data, the

set top terminal 220 can maintain an accurate record of all programs accessed/watched

by storing the data in EEPROM or RAM. Subsequently, this data can be transmitted to

the cable head end 208, where it can be used in carrying out network control and

monitoring functions (see col. 14, lines 50+) and operations center 220 uses this return

data for statistical or billing services (see col. 5, lines 53-54 and col. 8, lines26-34). In

addition, Hendricks discloses the hit movies category 1048 is a list of recently released

movies which have been found to be popular among movie goers (see figure 16 and

col. 32, lines 17-20). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting real-time

ratings information based on the activities of users at user television equipment; and

means for displaying the real-time ratings information on the user television equipment

in real time.

Regarding claim 70, Hendricks discloses the system comprising means for providing an opportunity for defining a time frame for the real time rating (see figure 16 and col. 32, lines 19-35).

Regarding claim 77, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting a genre for the real time ratings (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 78, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real-time ratings are for television programs (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 79, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real time ratings are for applications (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 80, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real time ratings are for non-program guide applications (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 81, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real time ratings are for video games (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 82, Hendricks discloses means for displaying real time ratings

information comprises means for displaying real time television program ratings (see

figures 14 and 16).

Regarding claim 83, Hendricks discloses means for displaying real time ratings

information comprises means for displaying real time video game ratings (see figure

14).

Regarding claim 86, Hendricks discloses means for allowing each user to select

which type of real time ratings are displayed (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 89, Hendricks discloses the real time ratings information

comprises a list of programs, the system further comprising means for selecting one of

the programs to purchase (see figures 16-17).

Regarding claim 90, Hendricks discloses the real-time ratings information

comprises a list of programs, the system further comprising means for selecting one of

the programs to set a reminder for that program (see figures 16, 19 and col. 34, lines

45-48).

Regarding claims 92-93, 100-106, 109, 112-113, the elements of the method

being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 69-70,

77-83, 86, 89-90 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims

69-70, 77-83, 86, 89-90

Regarding claim 115, Hendricks discloses a system in which an interactive

television program guide is implemented on user television equipment, comprising:

means for displaying program guide display screens on the user television

equipment with the interactive television program guide; and means for collecting

information on which program guide display screens are displayed in the interactive

television program guide (see col. 14, line 50+ and figures 28e-28g).

Regarding claim 116, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to

the elements of the system being claimed in claim 115 and are analyzed as discussed

in the rejection of claim 115.

Regarding claim 117, Hendricks discloses a system in which an interactive

television program guide is implemented on user television equipment, comprising:

means for providing an opportunity for a user to use non-program guide

applications on the user television equipment; and means for collecting information on

which non-program guide applications are used (see col. 14, line 50+ and figures 14

and 22's).

Regarding claim 118, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to

the elements of the system being claimed in claim 117 and are analyzed as discussed

in the rejection of claim 117.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-52, 54-60, 63-65, 67-68 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (US 6,412,110), and in view of

Seidman et al. (US 6,298,482).

Regarding claim 1, Schein et al. (hereafter referred to as Schein) discloses a

system in which advertisements are displayed for users by an interactive television

program guide implemented on user television equipment, comprising means for

displaying the advertisements on the user television equipment with the interactive

television program guide (see figure 7). However, Schein does not explicitly disclose

means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements.

Seidman discloses a system for monitoring the popularity of programs and

commercial messages according user activity. User activities is recorded in the

selection history records and transmitted to the head end (see figures 1 and 2A).

Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information on the usage of the

advertisements in the program menu. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein to

incorporate a means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements as

taught by Seidman in order to give more efficiency in providing advertisements to

consumers in future.

Regarding claim 2,Seidman discloses the historical report comprising number of

commercials viewed 74 (see figure 6). Inherently, the means for collecting information

on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the

amount that the advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 3, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprising

channel, program name, program category, name of selected object, sub-selection

information (see figure 4). Inherently, the means for collecting information on the usage

of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the location in the

program guide where the advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 4, Seidman discloses the system comprises means for

collecting information on which advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 5, Seidman the collecting information comprises the name of

program, the name of object selected (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprises

means for collecting advertisement identifier information, which identifies which

advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 6, Seidman discloses the historical report comprises number of

commercials viewed (figure 6). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting

information on the number of times each advertisement is displayed.

Regarding claim 7, Seidman discloses the selection record comprises channel

number, program name, program category, object name, sub-selection information,

(see figure 4). Inherently, the means for collecting information on the usage of the

advertisements comprises means for collecting information on which program guide

screens advertisements are displayed on.

Regarding claim 8, Seidman discloses once the user has selected from among

the alternatives which are displayed, the STB relays this selection to the head end, in

addition to storing the selection information in the user's selection history (see col. 5,

lines 53-56). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting information on

which screens are active when a given one of the advertisements is selected by one of

the users.

Regarding claim 9, Seidman discloses once the user has selected from among

the alternatives which are displayed, the STB relays this selection to the head end, in

addition to storing the selection information in the user's selection history (see col. 5,

lines 53-56). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting information on

which user actions result directly from selection of a given one of the advertisements by

one of the users.

Regarding claim 10, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the

usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the times

that advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 11, Regarding claim 10, Seidman discloses means for collecting

information on the times that actions are taken automatically by the program guide (see

figure 4).

Regarding claim 12, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises

channel number, program name, category name, object name, sub-selection

information, (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting

information on which screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 13, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises

channel number, program name, category name, object name, sub-selection

information, (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting

screen identifier information that uniquely identifies which program guide screens are

displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 14, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises

tuned channel (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting

information on the frequency with which certain program guide screens are displayed by

the program guide.

Regarding claim 15, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises tune

begin, tune end (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting

information on the duration for which program guide screens are displayed by the

program guide.

Regarding claim 16, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on how

users arrive at program guide screens in the program guide (see figure 2A-3).

Regarding claim 17, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on

which television programs are displayed on the user television equipment (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 18, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on whether a user interacts with the program guide during the display of a given program on the user television equipment (see figures 2A-3).

Regarding claim 20, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Seidman further discloses the detailed description of viewing behavior and activity is monitored and recorded in the selection history records 13 (see col. 6, lines 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for collecting information on whether a screen overlay is present on the user television equipment during the display of a given program on the user television equipment in order to provide a detailed description of user behavior.

Regarding claim 21, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on which non-program guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figures 4 – 6).

Regarding claim 22, Seidman discloses means for collecting information with the program guide on which non-program guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 23, Seidman discloses whenever user selects a program or

message from the menu, the selection information is recorded in the selection history

(see figures 2B –4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information

on how users invoke non-program guide applications on the user television equipment.

Regarding claim 24, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the

amount that non-program-guide applications are used on the user television equipment

(see figure 6).

Regarding claim 25, Seidman discloses the advertisements are transmitted to

user television from CATV head end, the system further comprises means for

monitoring when advertisements that are transmitted from the CATV head end to the

user television equipment (see col. 4, line 40 – col. 5, line 62).

Regarding claim 26, Seidman discloses the advertisements are transmitted to the

user television equipment from the head end; and means for monitoring when

advertisements that are transmitted from the head end are received at the user

television equipment (see col. 6, lines 9-25).

Regarding claim 29, Seidman discloses the collecting information on the user

activity is transmitted from the user television equipment to a data processing facility

(head end), and the head end generates "summary"-type historical reports (see figure 6)

and "detailed" type reports (see figure 7) according to the collected information (see col. 7, lines 39-43). Obviously, the system comprising means for filtering out less important information from the collected information at the head end in order to provide a high quality report.

Regarding claim 30, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 29. Official Notice is taken that filtering based on specific advertisements is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein and Seidman with a well-known technique of filtering based on specific advertisements in order to provide a quality collected information.

Regarding claim 31, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on advertisements usage comprises means for collecting information for multiple user profiles (see figures 5-7).

Regarding claim 33, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements in the interactive television program guide by substantially all users of the system (see figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 34, Seidman discloses when Viewer Response Monitoring

System is installed on the user's premises equipment (and optionally when other

viewers wish to use the system), a viewer profile 12 is created for the user and stored in

the STB RAM (see col. 6, lines 26-37). Inherently, the means for collecting information

on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the

usage of the advertisements in the interactive television program guide by a subset of

users of the system.

Regarding claims 35-52, 54-60, 63-65, 67-68, the elements of the method being

claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 1-18, 20-26,

29-31, 33-34 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 1-

18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-34.

6.   Claims 19, 27-28, 53, 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schein et al. (US 6,412,110) in view of Seidman et al. (US

6,298,482),and further in view of Aras et al. (5,872,588).

Regarding claim 19, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed

in the rejection of claim 1. However, neither Schein nor Seidman explicitly discloses

means for collecting information on whether the user television equipment is muted

during the display of the given program on the user television equipment.

Aras discloses separate AVI information for audio and video portions of AVMs

may be utilized. Thus, objectionable language may be silenced while the video portion

is presented (see col. 10, lines 17-20), and the user behaviors such are channel

change, swap, pause, rewind, off, mute, record, etc. These responses may be to

change a state variable, or to record information in the behavior collection table (see

col. 14, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein in view of Welsh to incorporate

a means as taught by Aras in order to allow advertiser to avoid using audio

advertisements in the program.

Regarding claim 27, Aras discloses the advertisements are transmitted to the

video distribution node from broadcast server and ITV server (see figure 1A). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify Schein and Seidman to incorporate server as taught by Aras in order to

reduce capacity of advertisements stored at the head end. In addition, it would have

been obvious that the server comprising means for monitoring when advertisements are

transmitted from the server to the video distribution node in order to control the

transmission.

Regarding claim 28, Aras discloses behavior of subscriber is transmitted from the

user television equipment to a behavior collection center (see figure 4A). Aras further

discloses collected information in the behavior collection table can be deleted, updated

(see col. 14, lines 8-12). Inherently, the system comprising means for filtering out less

important information from the collected information prior to transmission of the

collected information from the user television equipment.

Regarding claims 53, 61-62, the elements of the method being claimed

correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 19, 27-28

respectively and are analyzed with respect to the rejection of claims 19, 27-28.

7.   Claims 32 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Schein et al. (US 6,412,110), and in view of Seidman et al. (US 6,298,482), and

further in view of Furuya et al. (US 5,886,691).

Regarding claim 32, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed

in the rejection of claim 1. Seidman further disclosed messaged pertaining to the

embedded data may or may not be filtered out by the microcontroller, depending on the

viewer's history and interests (see col. 8, lines 21-50). However, neither Schein nor

Seidman explicitly discloses displaying the real time ratings information on the user

television equipment.

Furuya discloses displaying the real time ratings information on the user

television equipment (see 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein and Seidman to incorporate means for displaying the real-time rating information as taught by Furuya in order to provide user ratings information.

Regarding claim 66, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 32 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claim 32.

8.   Claims 71-76, 84-85, 94-99, 107-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335).

Regarding claims 71-75, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 70. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate means for providing an opportunity for defining a time frame of a particular hour, evening, day, week, instant for the real time ratings in order to provide rating of programs in a particular period of time, which would be the most interest to the consumers.

Regarding claim 76, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for providing an opportunity for selecting a geographic area for the real time ratings in order to provide user a rating of a particular

geographic area, which would be the most relevant to the consumers in a particular

area.

Regarding claims 84-85, the elements correspond to the elements of claim 72

and 75 respectively and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of

claims 72 and 75.

Regarding claims 94-99, 107-108, the elements of the method being claimed

correspond to the system being claimed in claims 71-76 and 84-85 and are analyzed as

discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 71-76 and 84-85.

9.   Claims 87-88,110-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335), and in view of Aras et al.

(5,872,588).

Regarding claim 87, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection

of claim 69. However, Hendricks does not explicitly disclose means for collecting

information on whether a muting function is used when certain programs are watched.

Aras discloses separate AVI information for audio and video portions of AVMs

may be utilized. Thus, objectionable language may be silenced while the video portion

is presented (see col. 10, lines 17-20), and the user behaviors such are channel

change, swap, pause, rewind, off, mute, record, etc. These responses may be to

change a state variable, or to record information in the behavior collection table (see

col. 14, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify Hendricks to incorporate a means as

taught by Aras in order to allowed provider to avoid using audio in the program.

Regarding claim 88, Aras discloses each subscriber activity such as channel

change or AVM stream change, pause, stop, picture in picture swap etc. or a filtered

subset will be recorded (see col. 7, lines 18-20). It would have obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for collecting information on whether any

portion of the video of a program is blocked as that program is watched in order to allow

provider avoid transferring the blocked program in the future.

Regarding claims 110-111, the elements of the method being claimed

correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 87-88 respective and

are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 87-88.

10.   Claims 91 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335), and in view of Herz et al. (US 5,351,075).

Regarding claim 91, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection

of claim 69. Hendricks further discloses the real time ratings information comprises a list

of program, the system further comprising means for selecting one of the programs to

watch (see figures 14-19). However, Hendricks does not explicitly disclose means for

selecting one of the programs to record.

Herz discloses means for selecting one of the programs to record (see col. 5,

lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify Hendricks to incorporate means for selecting one of the programs to record as

taught by Herz in order to allow view to watch the program later.

Regarding claim 114, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to

the elements of the system being claimed in claim 91 and are analyzed as discussed in

the rejection of claim 91.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Herz et al. (US 5,351,075) discloses home video club television broadcasting

system.

Barrett et al. (US 6,005,597) discloses method and apparatus for program

selection.

Miller et al. (US 5,842,199) discloses system, method and article of manufacture

for using receiver operating curves to evaluate predictive utility.

Welsh (US 5,374,951) discloses method and system for monitoring television

viewing.

Hendricks et al. (US 6,408,437) discloses reprogrammable terminal for

suggesting programs offered on a television program delivery system.

Tsukidate et al. (US 6,262,721) discloses service supply apparatus for supplying

a service of a broadcasting program with attribute information of the program.

Herz et al. (US 5,758,257) discloses system and method for scheduling

broadcast of and access to video programs and other data using customer profiles.

Takasu (US 6,279,157) discloses program data transmission checking method

and apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Son P Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-
1889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for
regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number
is 703-306-0377.

ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Son P. Huynh
September 27, 2002